

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 500

CS 211 560

AUTHOR Sperling, Melanie
 TITLE I Want To Talk to Each of You: Writing Conference Discourse and Individualizing the Process of Learning To Write.
 SPONS AGENCY National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Ill. Research Foundation.
 PUB DATE Apr 88
 GRANT NCTE-R87-32
 NOTE 60p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis; Ethnography; Grade 9; High Schools; *Individual Instruction; Qualitative Research; Student Writing Models; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes; Writing Research
 IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Student Conferences; *Writing Conferences

ABSTRACT

A study examined student-teacher writing conferences in a ninth grade English class to uncover what significance this form of instruction has both as a collaborative methodology and as a factor in individualizing the process of learning to write in the secondary school. Subjects included a successful ninth grade English teacher at a public high school in the San Francisco area and six students representing the range of ethnic diversity, gender ratio, and achievement level of the generally academically motivated, college-bound students attending the high school. During the 7-week period of observation, all classroom activities were recorded on video and audio tape and all student writing (drafts, outlines, peer group response, tests, teacher comments) concerning the three major papers completed were collected. Subjects were also interviewed twice. The data were analyzed by performing a descriptive quantitative discourse analysis across cases and a descriptive case study of one student across time. Results indicated that students need to participate in conferences of different lengths, with different purposes, and with different tasks. Results also indicated that patterns of dominance in the conferences shift as the tasks vary and that writing conferences promote the development of the student as a writer. Findings suggest the potential of the secondary school classroom to support dialogic learning as a means of individualizing the process of learning to write. (Forty-four references, five tables of data, and three sample student essays are attached.) (RS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

I Want to Talk to Each of You:
Writing Conference Discourse
and Individualizing the Process of Learning to Write

by

Melanie Sperling
University of California
Berkeley, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Melanie Sperling

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1988

Funding for this research was provided through a grant by the National Council of Teachers of English Research Foundation (#R87:32).

Funding for data collection was provided by a grant to Sarah W. Freedman from the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-083-0065).

The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the funding institutions and no official endorsement by these institutions should be inferred.

0951185D

INTRODUCTION

Misa is having a conference with her teacher about the essay she is writing, a character sketch of her friend Winifred. Part of the assignment for writing this character sketch is to capture the "real Winifred," no small task for a ninth grader:

Teacher: Well. [for transcription conventions, see note 1]
So she's very serious uh--

Misa: She looks' serious.

T: Yeah.
She looks' serious,
and on the surface she acts' serious if she (uc)
important stuff.
Right?

M: [Uh huh.
. . .
She gets her homework done.
I mean I ask her,
Oh are you finished?
Yes I am,
I went- wow'.
(laughs)

T: Ok.=

M: =That's right.
We have mostly all our classes together.

T: Uh huh.
But.
Then she has this other quality of uh-,=

M: =She has a sense of humor.
/umhm/
That's right.
If you didn't know Winifred,
(uc) just watch her,
you'd think she's real serious.

The conference from which the above is excerpted continues for a little over three minutes. It takes place at the back of the classroom where the teacher has set up two chairs. It ends like this:

T: Ok.
So you're gonna write about the way she appeared-
The main thing is you gotta write about somehow
the way she appears',
Let's say to me,
as teacher,

- M: Uh huh.
- T: and the way she is when you're with her.
- M: Yeah,
like when we're with friends,
/umhm/
and stuff like that.

The conference over, the teacher and Misa get up, simultaneously, from the two seats.

Writing has been said to be a solitary activity, a notion that, while it rides the surface of our knowledge about the writing process, may still be romantic enough to hang onto for literary license (see Bruffee, 1986, however, for a critical look at the notion that writing is an "individual act"). Yet learning to write, like learning to speak, is most surely a social activity, embedded in interactions with teachers and others (Cazden, 1982), such as the interaction illustrated in the above conversation.

For writing, like speaking, has a communicative function. And essential to learning to communicate is receiving response or feedback tailored to the communicative task at hand through interaction with those for whom the communication is intended. Both sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic research underscore the importance to spoken language acquisition of what might be called the "natural feedback" that beginning speakers receive as they develop toward the language needs and expectations of their older interlocutors. It is this same type of feedback that students acquiring written language might expect to receive when they write in school (Freedman, with Greenleaf & Sperling, 1987). It is often the case, however, that student writers must depend on a narrow range of often relatively ineffective teacher response modes that fall far short of addressing their individual and on-going needs as they attempt to communicate through writing (see, for example, Applebee, 1981; Langer, 1984). In fact, writing comments on student papers, an activity seen to be fraught with problems (see, e.g., Butler, 1980; Hahn, 1987; Sommers, 1982; Sperling & Freedman, 1987), remains the primary method by which teachers respond to their students' texts (Applebee, 1981; Freedman, et al., 1987; Searle & Dillon, 1980).

However, alternatives that capitalize on immediate teacher-student interaction and that have the potential for more meaningful individualization do exist, such as the one-to-one teacher-student writing conference. The teacher-student writing conference has been seen to flourish, in particular on the college level, in wedding the social to the academic as the maturing student develops toward the literacy expectations of adult peers (see, e.g., Blenski, 1976; Cooper, 1976; Freedman, 1979, 1980; Freedman & Katz, 1987; Freedman & Sperling, 1985;

Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Knapp, 1976; Murray, 1979; Rose, 1982; Walters, 1984). The importance of intertwining the social and the academic in the service of literacy acquisition also emerges in studies of young children interacting with one another while performing school writing tasks (Dyson, 1987; also, see Graves, 1983 on the elementary school teacher-student writing conference. See Florio-Ruane, 1986, and Michaels, Ulichny, & Watson-Gegeo, 1986, on stultified elementary school conferences). The inference to be made from observations of the social component in written language acquisition is that the teacher-student writing conference can be a significant factor in what Cazden (1982) calls the "social context for literacy."

Furthermore, in the context of the writing conference dyad, individualization of instruction can occur--it would seem optimally--for the teacher and student have an opportunity under those circumstances to pay exclusive attention to the student's learning. Such dyadic interactions invite what are often referred to as scaffolding behaviors, after Bruner et al. (e.g., Bruner, 1975, 1978; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). The concept of the scaffold has metaphoric appeal, yet because it is the teacher who is usually seen to build a scaffold for the student (see, e.g., Applebee & Langer, 1983), the metaphor invites us to ignore the constructive, active role of the student in the learning interaction (see, e.g., Cazden, 1983a): in the case of Misa's conference with her teacher, a look at Misa's input into the conversation shows it to be of no less interest than the teacher's ("communicative competence," says Bruner (1978, p. 244), has to do with dialogue" [emphasis mine]).

It is through the lens of the Soviet psychologists that teaching and learning have been perceived, perhaps most unambiguously, as integrated parts in a dynamic social process of knowledge construction. According to Vygotsky (1978), a learner reaches his or her developmental potentials--potentials that would not have otherwise been reached--by working interactively with more experienced individuals. In such interaction, the learner is said to work in a "zone of proximal development": "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). The concept of a zone of proximal development implies that learning is a collaborative effort which allows participants to work on a problem that at least one of them could not effectively do alone (see Newman, Griffin & Cole, in prep.). Typically, through such interaction, the child's notions come closer to the adult's (see Rogoff & Wertsch, 1984): the child is said to appropriate (Leont'ev, 1981) the culture's "tools" (the tool of language, for example) as represented by the adult. Not incidentally, Leont'ev suggests too that the teacher reciprocally applies the process of appropriation in interactions with the student, so that it is possible for the adult to redefine a situation in a way that does not coincide with his original

definition (see Wertsch, 1984). A strong implication of this work for research on written language acquisition in the school setting is that such explicitly dialogic literacy events as the teacher-student writing conference offer opportunities to examine this kind of reciprocity. Furthermore, if, as Vygotsky says, thought is the internalization of such social interaction, then in making external again this internalized interaction (see Bruffee, 1984, on the relationship of written text to dialogue), the writer's text in effect extends the interaction. That is, for a student learning to write, that text is an opportunity for the deliberate and explicit continuation of the teacher-student dialogue--to be internalized again and reflected anew in newer text. It is important, then, to explore how as partners in conversation teacher and student might work toward constructing the student's development as producer of written text. Such exploration entails a close examination of the conversations that constitute the interactions.

What follows is a report on a study of teacher-student writing conferences in a ninth-grade English class in which such conferences--usually rare not only for ninth-grade students and their teachers, but for students at any level of secondary school writing instruction (Applebee, 1981; Freedman, et al., 1987)--are highly valued and used frequently. A central aim of the study was to uncover what significance the teacher-student writing conference dyad has both as a collaborative methodology and as a factor in individualizing the process of learning to write in the secondary school.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Research was based on ethnographic methodology and took place as part of a larger ethnographic study of the role of response in the acquisition of written language. Only one classroom was studied, for this classroom allowed an unusual opportunity to examine in-depth both teacher-student writing conferences and a secondary school classroom that informs them.

Participants and Setting. The teacher, Mr. Peterson, was selected after an intensive search for and observations of Bay Area teachers who were teaching academic writing to ninth-graders and who were recommended by the Bay Area Writing Project and by local administrators and teachers as successful teachers of writing. He met certain criteria for study, including using a variety of response methods in his classroom, using class time effectively, articulating a philosophical framework for teaching writing, teaching in a school curriculum consistent with his beliefs, and covering a spectrum of writing concerns in his classroom. Ninth-grade students were chosen for study because they are at a transition time in their schooling and face new challenges to their writing and thinking. At the time of the study, students in Mr. Peterson's ninth-grade English class were in their second semester of ninth grade. The location where Mr. Peterson teaches is a San Francisco public high school which admits students on the basis of middle school or junior high

school grades and scores on a standardized test of basic skills (CTBS). Students attending this school are generally motivated academically and plan to go on to college after they graduate. Six students in Mr. Peterson's ninth-grade class were selected as focal students for this study. They represent the range of students in their school, including the range of ethnic diversity, gender ratios, and achievement level as measured by previous-semester grades and by CTBS scores in language arts. Rationale for selecting out focal students was that it was important to work with a number that could be followed effectively every day over the course of several weeks. The six students are:

Gina: a Caucasian girl with above-average to high grades the first semester of ninth grade (As and Bs) (there were no CTBS scores for Gina).

Barb: a part native American girl with above-average grades the first semester of ninth grade (As, Bs, and one C) and CTBS scores in language arts ranging from average to high (56 to 93 percentile).

Lisa: an Asian-American girl with high grades the first semester of ninth grade (all As) and high CTBS scores in language arts (81 to 96 percentile).

Misa: an Asian-American girl with high grades the first semester of ninth grade (all As and one B) and CTBS scores in language arts ranging from average to high (68 to 95 percentile). Unlike the other students, Misa also had a second-language problem.

Donald: an Asian-American boy, with high grades the first semester of ninth grade (all As and one B) and high CTBS scores in language arts (96 to 99 percentile).

Rhonda: a black girl with average to low grades the previous semester (Bs, Cs, and Ds) and CTBS scores in language arts ranging from average to high (60 to 92 percentile).

(An in-depth case study is provided for Misa, one of the more interactive focal students.)

Curriculum Sequence. During the observation period, students wrote three major papers. The three assignments had in common that they were observations, descriptions, and analyses of a person; that is, they were character studies. The assignments built on one another as students, making their own selections about whom to write on, moved from writing about someone they knew (Friend Study), to writing about a famous person in the culture (Famous Person Study), to writing about a character in Dickens' Great Expectations (GE Character Study). Conferences were held around the first two major papers. Preparatory work on all of these major papers began in week one

when students produced one-paragraph sketches of a GE character whom Mr. Peterson had selected for them, the students within a peer group being assigned the same character (GE Paragraph). Conferences were held around this assignment also. Each of these writing assignments also included pre-writing activities and a series of rough drafts around which there was peer group response.

Data Collection. All activity in the classroom, including teacher-student conferences, was observed and recorded on video and audiotape supplemented by extensive field notes. This occurred daily for seven weeks, the time it took for the teacher to cover the three major essay assignments. Interviews were taken on two separate occasions, both with the teacher and with selected focal students. All student writing was collected as it was being produced, including outlines, peer group response sheets, tests, filled-in dittoes, and the multiple drafts of essays on which the teacher had written comments. For this study, the primary data for the six students are the transcripts of teacher-student writing conferences, while all data sources inform the case study of Misa.

Data Analysis: Rationale. Conversation itself is an intrinsically collaborative activity: participants engage in taking turns in an orderly fashion, sequencing adjacent turns syntagmatically as answer follows question, acceptance follows offer, compliance follows request; participants cooperatively relate the meaning of one turn to that of the next; and they systematically relate talk to a shared context (Wells, 1981). Conversation also illustrates a truly protean event, taking its shape or form as interaction unfolds (Green & Wallatt, 1981). That is, meanings and interpretations are being continuously negotiated between participants (Gumperz, 1982). Classroom conversations are much more highly constrained but nonetheless collaborative (Campbell, 1986; Gumperz, 1981; McDermott, 1976; Mehan, 1979). In analyzing the data for the six focal students, it was important to see whether there were recurring conference discourse features that have theoretical implications for these conferences as collaborative events, and, if such features were found, to see whether they indicate that teaching and learning is individualized in conference discourse.

Data Analysis: Procedures. The analytic procedures that I followed in this study are built on Corsaro's (1985) ethnographic methodology for studying dyadic interaction in an instructional setting. Analysis is in two parts: (a) a descriptive quantitative discourse analysis across cases, and (b) a descriptive case look at one student across time, as context for the quantitative data. Following Corsaro, I conducted the analysis of teacher-student conferences in a series of steps or phases:

Phase 1: Theoretically Relevant Working Corpus. Using field notes as well as audio and videotapes for the purpose of

identifying theoretically relevant (see Corsaro, p. 32) dyadic patterns, I found conferences to be all conversations held between the teacher and one student which had as their focus the student's writing and as their outcome a potential modification of the process whereby the student acquires written language. For the six students under study, 41 such conferences were identified.

Phase 2: Organization of Audiovisual data, Reduced Corpus Useful for Further Analysis, Transcription of Reduced Corpus.

After cataloguing the conferences, the corpus was reduced to a balanced subset of 34 conferences, 6 for each student and 4 for Lisa (for whom there were only 4 all together). The subset maintained the overall texture of the conference setting, reflecting (a) the tasks around which conferences occurred: Task 1. GE Paragraph; Task 2. Friend Study; Task 3. Famous Person Study; (b) conference durations, as reflected in the way conferences were conceived by the teacher: quick (up to 3 minutes), prolonged (3 to 6 minutes), leisurely (over 6 minutes); and (c) the range of purposes for which conferences occurred: Planning conferences--to plan future text; Written Comment conferences--to clarify teacher's written comments; Feedback conferences--to give feedback on texts on which there were no written comments; External conferences--to cover concerns tangential--or external--to the immediate text. Transcription conventions were based on Tannen (1984).

Phase 3: Discourse Analysis. Examination of the transcripts led to the identification of theoretically relevant discourse features. Transcripts were coded for those features. The following features were identified:

Topical Concerns.

(1) Topic Initiation. As the conversation unfolds, both participants have, potentially, the opportunity to raise issues or to change the subject, that is, to initiate a topic. If it is always the teacher who initiates a topic, then the conversation is, by one measure anyway, inclined toward the teacher in a somewhat traditional classroom sense, with the teacher "controlling" the concerns of instruction. If, however, conference conversation is such that these traditional controls are altered, this traditional teacher "weight" reassigned, then students as well as teacher might raise issues or change the subject, that is, student as well as teacher might initiate topics throughout the conversation. Topic initiation, then, is specified on two levels: (a) teacher initiated or (b) student initiated.

(2) Topic Ownership. While either teacher or student initiate a topic, it is not necessarily the case that the topic that is raised is tied to or motivated by the initiator's own concern--which is to say, the initiator may not necessarily "own" the topic that he or she initiates. It may be, for example, that

the student initiates a topic that is tied to or motivated by the teacher's concern, or vice versa. Sometimes a topic is owned by both participants. Knowing about topic ownership, I speculated, should contribute another dimension to understanding the "balance of power" behind discourse topics in these conferences and potentially shed light on whether writing concerns and issues that originate with the teacher might come to be appropriated by the student through conference talk. Topic ownership is specified on three levels: (a) teacher owned, (b) student owned, and (c) teacher-and-student (both) owned.

Structural/Functional Concerns.

(1) Function of Conversational Turns. Conversations are structured so that Speaker A's turn works in conjunction with Speaker B's in a syntagmatic relationship. How these speaker turns function (e.g., to ask and answer questions, to make and comply with requests) reveals how participants maneuver conversationally with one another as, in constructing discourse, they contribute to such instructional ends as giving and receiving directions, seeking and finding information, offering and accepting one another's ideas. Function is specified on six levels: (a) request, (b) compliance, (c) offer, (d) acceptance, (e) question, (f) answer. (While other designations of syntagmatic structure--e.g., greeting-greeting, ending-ending, warning-response--are possible, the levels used for this study are taken to encompass a number of permutations that might under other circumstances need to be more finely designated. For the purposes of this study, for example, most all assertions are seen to be offers--offers of information, ideas, or advice. Directives are seen as requests--as when the teacher requests that the student re-write a topic sentence.)

(2) Turn Structure Initiation. While two speaker turns may work together as a syntagmatic unit (e.g. question-answer), one participant must initiate the unit by asking the question, offering the information, requesting the action. As with topic initiation, as the conversation unfolds, both participants have, potentially, the opportunity to initiate syntagmatic units. If it is always the teacher who asks the question, makes the request, extends the offer, waiting for the student to respond, then the conversation is, in one sense, inclined toward the teacher, the teacher steering the direction of the talk, much as classroom talk that follows an I-R-E structure (Initiation-Response-Evaluation [Mehan, 1979]) is steered by the teacher. As with topic initiation, this "weight" is reassigned when the student initiates a syntagmatic unit. While this feature may appear identical to "topic initiation," it is the case in fact that one participant may initiate a topic that is then sustained by any number of questions and answers, requests and compliances, offers and acceptances, some of which are initiated by the teacher, some by the student. Turn structure initiation is specified on two levels: (a) teacher initiated and (b) student initiated.

(3) Turn Structure Completion. Whereas any number of syntagmatic units get initiated, they do not all necessarily get completed. If in fact teacher and student work together to construct the discourse of their conversation, a construction process which leaves syntagmatic units dangling theoretically contrasts with one in which units are complete. Designating whether or not syntagmatic units are completed, then, could point toward ways in which teacher and student contribute to a mutual process. Turn structure completion is specified on two levels: (a) teacher initiated turn structures that get completed by the student, and (b) student initiated turn structures that get completed by the teacher.

On the basis of finding the theoretically relevant discourse features described above, I generated the following research questions, to be answered first through descriptive quantitative analysis and then elaborated through case study:

For each student,

1. What is the relative proportion of teacher-initiated topics? of student-initiated topics?
2. What is the relative proportion of teacher-owned topics? student-owned topics? teacher-&-student- (both-owned topics)?
3. What is the relative proportion of Request-Compliance turn structure units? Question-Answer turn structure units? Offer-Acceptance turn structure units?
4. What is the relative proportion of teacher-initiated turn structure units? student-initiated turn structure units?
5. What is the relative proportion of teacher-initiated turn structure units that get completed by the student? What is the relative proportion of student-initiated turn structure units that get completed by the teacher?

As conversations are theoretically creative events, their construction influenced by participants as they work within different contexts, toward different ends, for all questions above, the research also asks:

- A. Do the proportions vary according to the task around which conferences occur?
- B. Do the proportions vary according to the duration of the conference?
- C. Do the proportions vary according to the purpose of the conference?

Coding and Analyzing the Data. In order to answer the research questions, I coded all conferences for the discourse features specified above so that they could be analyzed by computer. I trained a research assistant in conference coding and she independently coded over one-third of the conferences under study, that is, 12 of the 34 conferences. Coding

reliability was determined by finding the percentage of codes on which we both agreed. Agreement on coding levels was approximately 90%; discrepancies were discussed so that 100% agreement was reached. SPSS X was used to obtain descriptive frequencies of the discourse features, and crosstabulations showed the frequencies as they were distributed over the variables of interest.

RESULTS OF THE QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Quantitative analysis shows the six students forming diverse interaction patterns with the teacher as they construct conference talk. Two students, Lisa and Misa, stand out for their generally relatively active roles in much of this construction process, although Gina comes close to them in this active role-taking. We also see Gina engage in less typical teacher-student interplay with the teacher than the other students. Barb, Donald, and to a smaller extent Rhonda are less active participants in their conference talk.

TOPIC INITIATION

Table 1 illustrates the proportion of topics arising in these conferences that are initiated by (a) the teacher, and (b) the student.

Insert Table 1 about here

For four of the students--Gina, Barb, Donald, and Rhonda--the teacher initiates topics most of the time, although in Gina's conferences the proportions of teacher-initiations and student-initiations approach identity. If topic-initiation is seen as an indicator of who directs conference conversations, this "norm" suggests that such direction typically belongs to the teacher. Yet Lisa and Misa prove a contrast to this assumption, initiating topics in their conferences most of the time and virtually reversing the proportions seen for the other students. We see Lisa steering the direction of her conferences, for example, when she begins a conference conversation with the assertion, "I don't understand how I can change my topic sentence, (L031)" and the rest of the conference centers on revising that sentence, or when she probes, "You know the first paragraph is the introduction, the second, third, and fourth you talk about each of . . . her moods, (L051)" and the rest of the conference centers on Lisa's organizing her paper around her character's moods. Misa does much the same thing, often with questions: "Mr. Peterson, does the discussion of the clothing he wears kind of contribute to the topic sentence?" (M023); "Mr. Peterson, what's a synonym of 'impression'?" (M023); "Um, ok, what if I do something like a convincing trait, like she's really a good student" (M052); "And how can I give lots of samples for this . . .?" (M052).

For some students, then, directing conference conversation by initiating topics can be a key element in determining conference talk. However, for most students in this sample,

topic initiation is by and large the teacher's role.

By Writing Task. Echoing the pattern for conferences seen overall, teacher-initiated topics tend to dominate across the series of writing tasks for Gina, Barb, Donald, and Rhonda. Yet Donald in first-task conferences and Rhonda in third-task conferences each initiates more topics than the teacher and in Lisa's third-task conferences, the teacher initiates more topics, thereby reversing the proportions when their conferences are seen overall. Notably, by second-task and third-task conferences, topic initiations become more diffuse across teacher and student for Lisa, Misa, Donald, and Rhonda. What this suggests is that as conferences move cross tasks, patterns of dominance tend to be tempered.

By Conference Duration. Except for Rhonda, whose conferences maintain the same proportion of teacher topic-initiations over student topic-initiations no matter how long they are, for the other students who participate in conferences of varying duration, the proportion of teacher topic-initiations tends, within student, to increase in prolonged and leisurely conferences. This is true even for Misa, whose topic initiations still dominate the teacher's but assume smaller relative proportions in longer conferences. While these proportions vary from student to student, it would appear that the teacher--at least as regards bringing up things to talk about--tends to control how "spun out" conferences can get.

By Conference Purpose. Conferences with different purposes appear to allow certain "non-initiators" to assume more initiating roles: Barb and Rhonda initiate 100% of the time in Feedback conferences, for example, and Donald, who initiates no topics in Planning or Feedback conferences, initiates topics at least some of the time in Written Comments conferences. Ironically in Misa's case, it is these same Written Comment conferences and not the others in which it is the teacher who, reversing the usual pattern with Misa, initiates topics at least some of the time. Written Comment and Planning conferences, furthermore, show more diffuse initiation patterns than do Feedback conferences, where initiations tend to be dominated by either teacher or student. While relative proportions within conference purposes follow no apparent patterns, the different conference purposes appear to open up a diversity of opportunities for both teacher and student to initiate conference topics.

In sum, for these conferences it is the teacher who in large measure initiates topics in conference conversation. But this does not hold true for all students. Misa and Lisa are seen to initiate a larger proportion of conference topics than the teacher no matter where in the sequence of writing tasks conference talk occurs and no matter how long conferences last, assuming an important role in directing conference talk. Also, the farther along in the series of writing tasks conferences

occur, the relative proportion of topic-initiations tends to diffuse across teacher and student. Purpose of talk tends to influence participation patterns, as conferences with different purposes appear to offer participants the opportunity to construct conversations according to the situation at hand, which means, for both teacher and student, breaking usual patterns of topic-initiation. However, longer conferences tend to include larger proportions of teacher topic-initiations for everyone, indicating the importance of the teacher's initiating role in sustained talk.

TOPIC OWNERSHIP

Table 2 shows the proportion of topics that are "owned" by (a) the teacher, (b) the student, and (c) both teacher and student together--which is to say, the proportion of topics that are tied to the teacher's concerns, the student's concerns, or the concerns of both teacher and student together.

Insert Table 2 about here

For all students except Lisa--who, as we saw, is also a "topic-initiating" student--the major proportion of topics is owned by the teacher, a much smaller proportion is owned by the students, and, when they occur, an even smaller proportion is owned by both together. We get a sense of how the teacher's concern undergirds and motivates conversation when, for example, Mr. Peterson asks for the gist of the anecdote Donald wrote about his friend (D043), leading Donald into an explanation ("Oh, he was in a race and um he fell down and (uc) finish") that continues over five conversational turns. Or, more dramatically, when Mr. Peterson indicates to Misa that she has to think of different personality traits for the character in her study (M092) and leads Misa into a speculation ("Oh, oh, she sometimes gets hyper and chases her grandma around the house") that develops across 50 conversational turns. In this vein, the teacher's concerns for the student's writing motivate most of these conversations.

By Writing Task. Where in the sequence of writing tasks these conferences take place does not seem to predict how proportions for topic ownership will unfold. For example, for Barb, Donald, and Rhonda, the proportion of student-owned topics increases by task-three conferences. The opposite is the case for Gina, Misa, and Lisa (Lisa, recall, shows more topic-ownership overall). Yet by third-task conferences, topic ownership is generally more diffused across teacher and student for all students than it is in first-task and second-task conferences. Again, as conferences move across tasks, patterns of dominance tend to be tempered.

By Conference Duration. Except for Misa, teacher-owned topics in these conferences tend to dominate no matter how long conferences last. Misa, however, once again joins Lisa as student-owned topics dominate her quick conferences and are apportioned equally with teacher-owned topics in her leisurely

conferences. Yet to some extent for all the students who have conferences of varied lengths, student-owned topics tend to assume smaller relative proportions in the longer conferences, as topic-ownership tends to be concentrated with the teacher. Again, then, in longer conferences the teacher assumes a more salient role.

By Conference Purpose. New topic-ownership patterns emerge in conferences with different purposes. Most evident is the pattern for Written Comment conferences. For Gina, Barb, and Rhonda, these conferences are fully dominated by teacher-owned and teacher-and-student-(both-) owned topics--but of course teacher written comments, which are the springboard for these conferences, embody by their very nature the teacher's concerns. Yet even in Written Comment conferences, Lisa, Misa, and to a much smaller extent Donald have conversations that include student-owned topics as well. In contrast, Feedback conferences are fully dominated (that is, 100% of the time) by student-owned topics for Barb, Misa, and Rhonda, as apparently, with no teacher comments to guide the discussion, they voice their own concerns in order to get response to their writing. Yet for Donald, topics in Feedback conferences are fully teacher-owned, and for Gina, topic ownership is shared equally between her and the teacher. While Written Comment conferences, then, predict in a limited way that topics will be primarily teacher-owned, other conference purposes do not so easily predict how topic-ownership will be distributed. Yet Written Comment conferences and to a lesser extent Planning conferences show a general diffusion across teacher and student of topic ownership not seen for Feedback conferences, where ownership tends to be concentrated with either teacher or student. Different conference purposes appear again to open up opportunities differently for these students regarding how much of the conference they will steer, in this case as a result of "owning" topics.

In sum, for these conferences, it is the teacher who owns the highest proportion of topics in conference talk. But this does not hold true for all students and in some cases the proportions are reversed--though with no apparent pattern. By third-task conferences, topic-ownership becomes more diffusely distributed across teacher and student. However, longer conferences tend to include larger proportions of teacher-ownership of topics, again indicating the influence of the teacher in sustained talk. ^{CONFERENCE} ~~CONFERENCE~~ purpose is a limited predictor of topic-ownership, yet as with topic-initiation, different purposes appear to open up opportunities to different students to interact with the teacher in covering topics of their own concern.

TURN STRUCTURE/FUNCTION

Table 3 illustrates the proportion of conversational turns that are structured by (a) requests and compliances, (b) questions and answers, and (c) offers and acceptances.

Insert Table 3 about here

For four of the six students--Barb, Lisa, Misa, and Donald--the highest proportion is for turns structured by questions and answers, as in the following exchange between Mr. Peterson and Barb (B041), in which Mr. Peterson is trying to get Barb to see the connection between her friend's life and the characteristics of her friend's personality:

- T: Ok.
Plays piano,
Which part of her personality is that one.
- B: That would be-- minister's [i.e. she is the daughter of a minister]
- T: Ok.
Gymnastics?
- B: That would be Lowell [i.e. she is a student at Lowell High School]
- T: Umhm
Church choir,
obvious.
/yes/
Yells at her brothers,
how about that?
- B: Well (uc) . . . I don't know.
That would kinda be like both,
I guess. [. . .]

In contrast, for Gina and Rhonda, the highest proportion is for turns structured by offers and acceptances--which generally means that participants are offering one another information and receiving that information in what might be perceived as typical conversational exchanges, as when Gina (G011) says to Mr. Peterson, "There's a a whole description of them [Mr. and Mrs. Hubble] here that um most of them seem to me to be um Pip's opinion," and Mr. Peterson replies by reading back to Gina the GE passage that Gina is referring to. For the other students, the second highest proportion is for turns structured by such offers-acceptances. For all six students, the lowest proportion of turns is structured by requests-compliances: prototypical "instructional" directives, then, in the form of requests (as when Mr. Peterson says to Gina, "Put 'juvenile' in quotes, see" [G011]) happen relatively infrequently in these conferences.

By Writing Task. Patterns do not vary in meaningful ways from one writing task to another.

By Conference Duration. The patterns that the proportions assume do not vary in meaningful ways in quick, prolonged, or leisurely conferences. However, while the overall patterns remain stable, the proportions themselves shift. Within students, the relative proportion of request-compliance structures in leisurely conferences (for those students who have leisurely conferences) is higher than it is in the shorter conferences--suggesting that these lengthy conferences invite more direction-giving perhaps because teacher and student have a chance to contextualize the directions so that they are meaningful for the student. Leisurely conferences also see, within students, lower relative proportions of question-answer structures than in shorter conferences--suggesting that these structures are giving way to requests-compliances. The relative proportions within student of offers-acceptances remains largely the same for all conference durations.

By Conference Purpose. The patterns that the proportions assume do not vary much according to conference purpose. However, again while these overall patterns remain stable, we can see that the relative proportion of request-compliance structures is, for all students except Gina, higher in Written Comment conferences than it is in conferences with other purposes, suggesting that the teacher's written comments are a springboard for direction-giving in order that students may act on those comments and change their texts (as when Mr. Peterson tells Lisa [L131], "Think about getting a lot more you into [your paper]"). There are no other meaningful variations.

In sum, conversational turns are structured such that the relative proportions of requests-compliances, questions-answers, and offers-acceptances pattern in stable ways within students regardless of when in the series of tasks conferences occur, how long they last, or what the conference purpose is. Furthermore, these patterns are similar among students as well: for most students, conferences are dominated by question-answer structures. Yet leisurely conferences tend to include a higher relative proportion of request-compliance structures than conferences of shorter durations, and request-compliance structures assume higher relative proportions in Written Comments conferences than they do in conferences with other purposes. Beyond these two patterns, turn structures show unpatterned variations from situation to situation.

TURN STRUCTURE INITIATIONS

Table 4 shows the relative proportions of total request-compliance, question-answer, and offer-acceptance units that are (a) teacher-initiated and (b) student-initiated.

Insert Table 4 about here

Across all students, the highest proportion is for units initiated by the teacher. We get a sense of this initiation pattern in exchanges such as the one between Rhonda and Mr.

Peterson in which Mr. Peterson asks a question, gets a partial response from Rhonda, then repeats the question which Rhonda then answers (R071):

T: Do you have a paper today?

R: This is not--

T: -No no no no.
Do you have a-

R: No I mean to see' you about this.
That's I was supposed to see you today.

Mr. Peterson then initiates an offer-acceptance exchange--
[But that doesn't mean you're not
supposed to do this'.

R: (slight laugh)

--and the conversation continues with Mr. Peterson's directing the structure with his questions, requests, and offers. If such initiations are seen as indicators of who directs conference conversations, this pattern suggests that such direction typically belongs to the teacher. Yet the proportions for Misa's conferences veer considerably from the norm, for she initiates units 40% of the time, approximately twice as much as the other students. Thus she determines, almost as much as Mr. Peterson, the way her conversations function--that is, to seek and obtain information, to exchange ideas, to direct action. In this pattern, she echoes her tendency to initiate topics, as seen earlier.

By Writing Task. Except for Misa's and Donald's conferences, the proportion patterns tend not to vary regardless of where in the series of writing tasks conferences occur. There are no other meaningful patterns.

By Conference Duration. The proportions of teacher-initiations are higher than the proportions of student-initiations for all students regardless of conference duration, except in the case of Misa's quick conferences. In Misa's quick conferences the proportions are reversed, as the proportion of student-initiations exceeds that of teacher-initiations. In fact, Misa's quick conferences are not unlike the other students', for we see that the relative-proportions of student-initiations in quick conferences for all students are higher than they are in prolonged and leisurely conferences. As is the case with topic initiation, then, it appears to be the teacher's role as conferences get structured not only to direct--but to "spin out"--conference talk.

By Conference Purpose. While generally the proportion

patterns do not vary with conference purpose, in Feedback conferences, Barb, Misa, and Rhonda all initiate turn structure units more than does the teacher. Misa also initiates turn structure units more than does the teacher in Planning conferences. It would appear, then, to a limited extent, that the purpose of conference talk has something to do with how teacher and student participate in structuring the talk, and that a diversity of purposes affords teacher and student opportunities to interact in different ways.

In sum, the teacher takes the lead over the student in determining the structure of conference talk through his questions, offers, and requests, which the student must then answer, accept, and comply with. This is the case regardless of where in the series of writing tasks conferences occur and regardless of how long conferences last. However, the teacher determines the structure of talk proportionately more in longer conferences, indicating his role in sustained talk. It is when the purpose of conferences varies that students appear to have more opportunities to play determining roles in structuring conference conversation.

TURN STRUCTURE INITIATIONS AND COMPLETIONS

Table 5 shows the relative proportion of units (a) that the teacher initiates--in asking questions, making offers, making requests--and that the student completes--in answering the questions, accepting the offers, complying with the requests, and (b) that the student initiates and that the teacher completes.

Insert Table 5 about here

For all students except Lisa, the proportion of student-initiated/teacher-completed units is higher than of teacher-initiated/student-completed units. The numbers suggest that when the teacher talks the student is sometimes not listening or is sometimes not able to reply. Or that when the student talks the teacher has ready responses because he either "knows more" or is more conscientious about interacting. Yet it is also the case that the teacher often puts a "coda" on conference talk, offering an encapsulation of the conference that the student does not respond to, as when in G085 Mr. Peterson summarizes for Gina the writing task ahead: "Paul uh Paul Newman sounds pretty good to me. But you will have to- it will take you a little bit of work with the Reader's Guide. That's fine." In fact, the student sometimes does this too, as when in M023 Misa announces, "Ok. So I just leave it the way it is." It is also the case that teacher and student often step on each other's words, so that, for example, the offer initiated by the teacher is appropriated by the student, the student taking over the offerer's role, as when in G035 Mr. Peterson offers information, Gina appropriates the offer, and Mr. Peterson accepts:

T: Well-- I don't think it's consis- I think the the uh-

G: It doesn't say what I want to say (slight laugh).
I can't think of a word,

T: Yeah, conservative isn't the word [. . .]

The mismatch between teacher-initiation and student-completion of units, then, indicates not so much student ineptitude as the complex and protean nature of conversational structure (and function) in these conferences. That a proportion, though lower, of student-initiations do not get completed by the teacher suggests the same thing.

By Writing Task. In different writing tasks the proportions do vary, but there is no pattern to this variation. For example, in first-task conferences, the proportion of teacher-initiations that get completed by the student is higher than the proportion of student-initiations that get completed by the teacher for Barb, Lisa, Misa, and Rhonda. The same is true for Rhonda's second-task conferences and for Gina's third-task conferences. That this unpatterned variation exists suggests the varied nature of conference structuring interplay at different times in the series of tasks.

By Conference Duration. Regardless of conference duration, the pattern varies very little: there tends to be a lower proportion of teacher-initiated/student-completed structures than student-initiated/teacher-completed structures in quick, prolonged, and leisurely conferences. There are no other trends apparent.

By Conference Purpose. The pattern varies slightly for conferences of different purposes, as in Barb's and Rhonda's Planning conferences, Misa's, Donald's and Rhonda's Feedback conferences, and Rhonda's External-Concern conferences, the proportion of student-initiated/teacher-completed structures is lower than or the same as the proportion of teacher-initiated/student-completed structures. The variation follows no particular pattern, however, suggesting in part the individual nature of conference structuring interplay, but suggesting too that a diversity of purposes affords the opportunity for these differences to occur.

In sum, the relative proportion of teacher-initiated/student-completed turn structures is generally lower than the proportion of student-initiated/teacher-completed turn structures. That there is an initiation-completion mismatch in both cases, however, suggests that both teacher and student actively construct the talk in these conferences as unfolding constraints dictate. That the proportions alter slightly in conferences over the series of writing tasks, that they alter for conferences with different purposes, and that they do so in both cases in unpatterned ways suggests the individual nature of this conference structuring interplay.

CONCLUSION

While different students might be expected to interact differently with the teacher, it is telling that interaction patterns often vary not only for different students but also under different circumstances--students sometimes grouping as to how their conference interactions pattern as the place in the sequence of tasks on which conferences center changes, as the duration of the conference changes, or as the purpose of the conference changes. The construction of conference talk is seen to be molded by rhetorical as well as personal constraints, the teacher and student working together but working together in different ways depending both on the players and on the game.

In order to see how the quantitative analysis informs specific conferences, a descriptive examination of Misa's conferences with Mr. Peterson follows.

MISA'S CASE

Misa's conferences with Mr. Peterson and the written drafts to which the conferences are addressed reveal an engaged, persevering student writer for whom dialogue with a knowledgeable adult tests and shapes the control and direction that she is in the process of assuming over her own writing. The push and pull, give and take, of conference talk affords Misa the chance to assume authority as a writer as she both creates and seizes opportunities to master the information, skills, and values that inhere in the mature writer's world as that world is represented by the teacher. As through her conferences and texts we see Misa address the three tasks under study, we see her exercising control of her writing, enacted in part in the control she reveals in the dialogues with Mr. Peterson.

First-Task Conferences: GE Paragraph

Task One asks for a one-paragraph study of a character in Great Expectations (GE). Mr. Peterson has each peer group work on one GE character, each student in the group writing his or her own paragraph about that character. Before writing their paragraphs, the students have worked collaboratively in their groups on filling in a chart that asks for: (a) how the character looks, including what the character wears; (b) what the character's moves and mannerisms are; (c) what others say about the character; (d) what the character does; (e) what the character says. The information that they generate together for the chart is meant to give each of them material to use in their paragraphs. The students in Misa's group write their paragraphs about the convict.

Misa has only one conference (M023) with Mr. Peterson for this assignment, and it occurs when she works in her peer group on the day first drafts are due. The conference comes about because Misa has some concerns about the content of her text.

In their groups, the students are engaged in giving one another feedback on the efficacy of their paragraphs' topic sentences and supporting evidence. This group work surfaces a knotty problem for Misa, a problem that others in her group share: Misa is faced with reconciling what she has written--which centers on the convict's actions--with what she and the group collectively infer to be likely and likable texts for Mr. Peterson--that is, if the chart is any indication, their paragraphs should probably cover looks as well as deeds. But the paragraph Misa has written, with a topic sentence that presents the convict as a "ruffian," describes only the convict's ruffian-like behavior, not his appearance:

The convict in the "Great Expectations" is a ruffian. He threatens Pip with a story he has made up to keep Pip under his thumb. For example, to ensure that Pip obeys his order to get him a file and some "wittles", he tells Pip that he has a young man with him who will tear out Pip's heart and liver if Pip betrays the convict in any way. In addition, the convict tells Pip that compare to the young man, the convict himself is an angel. When ever the convict questions Pip, he often stares hard into the boy's eyes and roughly grasping on Pip's limbs or clothing. For instance, the convict tilts Pip down time after time to glare at Pip until he promises to do as he orders. Also, when Pip informs the convict he has seen the young man. The convict seizes Pip by the collar and stares at him for further explanations.

When they consider Misa's topic sentence and supporting evidence, the group is concerned on two counts. They are concerned, first, that the topic sentence may not adequately indicate that the paragraph is going to describe the convict's actions:

S1: But does everything lend to the topic sentence though?

S2: I think so.

S3: Well maybe you could add a little bit more to the topic sentence. . . . Like the cause and effect.

Then, when they begin to compose a possible revision for the topic sentence, the second concern arises, for the revised topic sentence brings on another problem:

M: How should I do it? Like (composes) the convict in Great Expectations is a ruffian because of the way he acts and the way he's dressed?

. . .
Then I'd have to add, you know, how he is dressed . . .
[that is, add description about dress to her paragraph]

In what proves to be typical fashion for her, Misa tackles the problem only so much with her peers. After a few seconds of silence she suggests to them that she figure it out with Mr. Peterson: "Should I ask him?"

Mr. Peterson has made himself available to students by walking around the room as they work in their groups and so Misa at this point initiates the quick conference with him. In so doing, she also initiates the topic they will discuss, a topic that, as her peer group work indicates, she "owns." Without disengaging herself from her peers, she attracts Mr. Peterson's attention and begins a conversation:

M: Mr. Peterson,

T: Yeah.

M: Does the discussion of the clothing he wears,
kind of contribute to the uhm . . the topic sentence,
Do I have to add,
how he is dressed.
. . . cause all I describe is actions.

When Mr. Peterson answers that talking about the convict's clothing is probably not relevant to her paragraph, Misa pursues the matter, following up her first question with a second:

M: No?

Her tone of voice indicates her surprise, and her peers' echoes of "You don't?" indicate theirs. Refining Misa's topic sentence had surfaced an issue for them that has as much to do with following what they perceived as "directions" (the chart) as it did with rhetorical choices. Misa's "No?" serves to mediate Mr. Peterson's response, to force him to think more about the writing strategies--and assignment--under discussion, in effect opening up an opportunity for Mr. Peterson to clarify the problem for himself as well as for Misa before settling upon a final answer to Misa's original question:

T: Well you mean his dress,

M: Yeah the way his dress,

T: Well- ok- if you want to say he gives- let's say- the convict is' a ruffian.
right.

M: Uh huh,
All I- =

T: =If you want to say he gives the impression' of being a ruffian,

See the difference.

Mr. Peterson is making a fine distinction here, one that will steer Misa's final choices for what to include in her paragraph by elucidating the rhetorical concern behind the choice, and his question to her--"See the difference?"--appears to seek for a confirming "yes" or "no." Misa does not make such a confirmation. Instead she uses her next turn in the conversation again to mediate his response and elicit an extension of it:

M: Like how he looks,
outwardly.

T: [
Ok,
[. . .]
Yeah,
Right.
That's where the- . . all right or if you were to say,
He both looks',
and acts',
rough',

This exchange clarifies the distinction between writing about what the convict really is and about what he gives the impression of being through "how he looks outwardly." At the same time, of course, it implicitly clarifies that what had been perceived as Mr. Peterson's fixed expectation for these texts is in fact a flexible guideline, shaped by rhetorical context and the writer's intentions. It appears to confirm for Misa that, consonant with her original intention, her paper might be able to dispense with impressions and stick to actions. She moves toward closure on this point by re-opening her original concern to Mr. Peterson, thereby reaffirming it, but this time rather than posing a true question she states--and tests--her authorial intent with an offer of contextualizing information:

M: But then like-
right now in the paragraph,
all I'm trying to put,
I'm just (uc) manner he- he acts',
that's it.

Mr. Peterson reasserts his original response to her, that dress, then, is "a little bit irrelevant," and Misa ends the exchange with her own summing up of how she will handle her draft:

M: Ok.
So I just just leave it-
/yeah/
the way it is.

The conference has allowed Misa to examine a rhetorical strategy that in her mind and in the minds of her peers had begun

to look problematic in light of their interpretation of Mr. Peterson's expectations and to work through a solution with Mr. Peterson that is in fact compatible with--and has the effect of confirming--her original plans. Through a quick dialogue, which serves to give Misa feedback on this first draft of a developing text, Misa and Mr. Peterson have been able to merge their authorial worlds, each bringing his or her own into congruence with the other's. This appears to occur as a result of Misa's pursuing and confirming Mr. Peterson's response and Mr. Peterson's willingness to think out loud and respond honestly to her concerns. In this first assignment and in the one conference that Misa has with Mr. Peterson regarding this assignment, we see indications of how conference talk allows Misa a kind of collaboration with the teacher that serves to refine her own emerging writer's self through negotiation and discovery.

Second-Task Conferences: Friend Study

Task Two asks each student to write a character study of a friend or acquaintance. The assignment covers a number of drafts, beginning with a one-paragraph anecdote about the person and ending with a full essay into which the anecdote gets incorporated. Misa writes about Winifred, a studious ninth grader and special friend who happens also to be a student in Mr. Peterson's class.

Misa has four conferences with Mr. Peterson during the writing of this character study. Whether or not Misa initiates the conferences, as she does for Task One, within the conferences for Task Two she often initiates the topics that will affect her text:

(M052) Mr. Peterson is responding to students who raise their hands and signal his attention. When Misa gets his attention, he walks over to her desk and she begins:

M: Um,
Ok um,
What if- what if I do something like a contrasting
trait,
like she's really a good student.

T: Is that-

M: She is.
/yeah/
But then like- when she's at home,
she's she's kinda like um mischievous.
But should I have a paragraph um,
another character trait,
in between those two?

In fact, in her last 16-minute conference, 17 topics get raised, and of these Misa initiates eight.

Yet even discussing topics that Mr. Peterson initiates, and discussing topics that are tied to his, not her, concerns (topics, that is, that he "owns"), Misa's participation still reveals her initiative. She determines to no small extent the work of the conference talk, and is a key player in the dialogue that is meant to result in her development as a writer.

The first conference for this assignment, when Mr. Peterson calls students up one by one to the back of the room, provides a telling example of Misa's creating, along with Mr. Peterson, the information that will result in the content for her paper. The anecdote which is the focus of the conference (see Figure 1) centers on how Misa's friend Winifred goes about writing a particular World Geography assignment.

Insert Figure 1 About Here

As the anecdote indicates, Misa sees Winifred as one of those ideal students who actually does things ahead of time: "While her classmates including me are still pushing our reports till the last possible minute to the due date, she goes on and starts preliminary outlines concerning her project." We hear how Winifred "hurriedly with lightning speed" gets information from the almanac, and produces, within a few days, "detailed and artistic illustrations" so that "little by little, her work is near completion."

This, however, is just one picture of Winifred, so this first conference in this group of four is devoted to discussing other qualities of Winifred's which Misa can develop in subsequent drafts, besides what Mr. Peterson calls "this persistence." Developing the two-sidedness of a person is a central concern for Mr. Peterson in these first conferences, so there is little doubt that Mr. Peterson "owns" the focal issue of this conference, and in fact he initiates this issue almost as soon as Misa sits down with him. But the chance at dialogue provides Misa with the opportunity, in effect, to incorporate his concern. His initial question, "So what are the qualities that she has- she gonna have besides this uh persistence?", elicits a series of teacher-initiated questions and answers through which Misa, her voice clearly indicating her enthusiasm about her topic, tells about another Winifred and highlights what in her final paper she will espouse as the "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" of Winifred's personality:

T: So what are the qualities that she has- she gonna have besides this uh . . . persistence.

M: Oh,
oh,
she she she sometimes gets hyper,
and she chases her grandma around the house.

- T: Chases her grandma around the house?
Oh.
- M: (laughs) With a loaf of bread.
- T: A loaf (stutters) of bread?
Is she kidding,
or is she serious.
- M: No (laughs) she was just you know- you know- hyper.
She's just- you know,
uhm joking around.
But her grandma fights back,
you know.
I wouldn't worry about the grandma.

As the conference continues, Mr. Peterson picks up on the information that Misa provides and, in a teacherly mode, outlines the strategies that she needs to follow to create the next draft of her character study: he tells her that she needs to write about the serious side that "everybody knows" about Winifred, and "the other side of her that you [Misa] know about." Even this request, however, while voiced by Mr. Peterson, is a jointly constructed product of the conference talk, as can be seen in a series of exchanges that has Misa and Mr. Peterson jockeying as bearers of information, offerers of strategy, each participant's contribution feeding the other's such that at times they even complete each other's sentences, appropriating the talk and in effect appropriating the ideas being talked about:

- (1) T: Well.
So she's- she's very . . . serious' uh--,
- (2) M: She- she- she looks' serious.
- (3) T: Yeah.
She looks' serious,
and on the surface she acts' serious.
(if she?) (uc) important stuff.
Right?
- (4) M: [Uh huh.
. . .
She gets her homework done.
I mean I ask her,
Oh are you finished?
Yes I am,
I went- wow'.
(laughs)
- (5) T: Ok.=
- (6) M: =That's right.
We have mostly mostly all our classes together.

- (7) T: Uh huh.
But.
Then she has this other quality of uh- ,=
- (8) M: =She has a sense of humor.
/umhm/
That's right.
If- if you didn't know Winifred,
(uc) just watch her,
you'd think she's real serious.
You'd- you wouldn't think that- you know- =
- (9) T: =ok.
Why don't you write about like,
the unknown Winifred.
Right?
Right?
Write- first of all write about what everybody
knows about her,
right?
- (10) M: Uh huh.
Do something about-
- (11) T: Kid who does all her (uc) on time,
and uh,
and gets all high scores and stuff.
/uh huh/
and then write about the other' side of her that
you know about.

It seems reasonable to characterize this interaction as an appropriating exchange, in which the participants, with one another's help, take turns in "taking over" the talk in order to construct a message. Specifically, Misa picks up on Mr. Peterson's reference to Winifred's being serious (turn 1), taking it a step further by asserting not that she is serious, but that she looks serious (turn 2). Mr. Peterson takes Misa's assertion further still when he says that "on the surface" Winifred acts serious (turn 3). He encourages Misa to think about this "surface" behavior, which she does (turns 4 and 6). He then begins to predicate another idea (turn 7)--that Winifred has "this other quality"--but Misa cuts him off and completes the predication (turn 8): "She has a sense of humor." Mr. Peterson reinforces everything they have discussed thus far in posing a suggestion for how to write about Winifred's two sides (turn 9), and Misa is ready to elaborate on this suggestion (turn 10)--"Uh huh. Do something about-" when Mr. Peterson completes her sentence (turn 11). This last statement from Mr. Peterson, in which he suggests that Misa write about "the other side of [Winifred] that you know about," leads to a lengthy unfolding elaboration in which Misa, assisted by Mr. Peterson's interjections, reveals information about the Winifred that indeed

only she knows about:

- (12) M: Because like- it's it's like- after I know her for awhile,
you know,
and then' I know she has a sense of humor,
about something similar to mine.
Sometimes I- you don't have to go,
into details of how or what's happening,
she just know what's going on.
- (13) T: She (knows?),
- (14) M: Really.
Yeah.
She's- if I just mention one (uc),
she knows what I'm talking about.
She kind of pick it up.=
- (15) T: =Like what.
- (16) M: Like- I don't know,
. . it's like- sometimes we pick up little things
(uc).

In this unfolding of information dominated by Misa, Mr. Peterson's short questions (turns 13 and 15) push Misa to explain the things Winifred "picks up" on when the she and Misa are together, even though the push does not result in Misa's fully exemplifying the "little things." Notably, all talk of Winifred's being "hyper" has, by the end of the conference, been tempered and subordinated so that, when the conference is over, Misa and Mr. Peterson are focusing on Winifred's humor and her canniness as a friend.

The conference ends with Mr. Peterson offering a kind of summary of what they have been discussing (turns 17 and 19 below), yet Misa characteristically helps to create this summary by inserting her own thoughts (turn 20) and merging them with his:

- (17) T: Ok.
So you're gonna write about the way she appeared-,
the main thing is you gotta write about somehow
the way she appears',
let's say to me,
as teacher,
- (18) M: Uh huh.
- (19) T: and- and the way she is when you're (with her?).
- (20) M: Yeah,
like when we're with friends

/umhm/
and stuff like that.

In fact Misa does write about these two sides of Winifred, and produces Draft #2 (see Figure 2).

Insert Figure 2 about here

In this draft, Misa begins with her anecdote from Draft #1 about Winifred's being a serious student, then adds to this account a long section on Winifred's "other side," the humorous side seen by family and friends. That Winifred is "hyper," the issue on which Misa's conference talk initially centers, is, as it comes to be in the conference, a subordinate issue in the paper, that quality encapsulated as "mischievous behavior," a trait which Misa uses to exemplify Winifred's sense of humor. The idea of Winifred's intuitive picking up on things is dropped in this paper, much as it had been in the conference, the paper ending with the more general assertion that Winifred "is cheerful and causes joy to her family and friends."

Third-Task Conferences: Famous Person Study

Task Three asks for a character study of a famous person. Misa writes about England's Princess Diana, as do a number of other girls in the class. For this assignment, Misa produces two drafts, a first draft and a final draft.

Misa has one conference with Mr. Peterson during the writing of this character study. Mr. Peterson has told the class that he wants to talk to each of them; he wants to help them get their writing closer to the kind of character study they did of their friend or acquaintance. He tells students they are free to come up to him one at a time to consult on these papers, but since there is not enough class time for accomplishing this, some students, including Misa, go to his office for their conferences. The students who go to his office get longer conferences than the ones who talk to him in class. Misa's conference lasts 4 minutes 12 seconds, in contrast to the in-class conferences which last around 1 minute or even less. In conference, Misa and Mr. Peterson discuss her first draft, on which Mr. Peterson has written some comments (see Figure 3).

Insert Figure 3 about here

As in previous conferences, this one is again characterized by what we can now see clearly as typical exchanges for Misa and Mr. Peterson. Particularly noticable are the appropriating exchanges, for, in contrast to their talk in earlier conferences, Misa and Mr. Peterson almost step on each other's lines as they construct sentences and ideas together. Take the following excerpt from this conference:

Misa and Mr. Peterson discuss the first two sentences in Misa's text, which read, "Baby blue eyes peeking from behind her side swept hair, sits a true English lady. Her peaches and cream complexion is display by her soft pastel off-the-shoulders silk evening gown." Mr. Peterson is reading the text aloud, mumbling through the reading; Misa initiates the interaction:

- (1) M: Do I have==
- (2) T: =No no no no no no.
What you want is another subject'.
- (3) M: Another subject?
- (4) T: Yeah.
She sits',
- (5) M: Oh.
- (6) T: Or you could say she sits like' a true English lady,
if you want-
You need a subj- see.=
- (7) M: =Oh you want to end' the sentence.
- (8) T: Yeah,
right.
And start a new sentence.=
- (9) M: And you want . . . turn' this around.
so- so-
- (10) T: [So that your "her--',
peaches and cream complexion",
So what would the subject be.
. . .
Instead of "her peaches and cream complexion',
is displayed by her soft"-
- (11) M: [Make it like her soft pink
(uc) off-the-shoulder silk evening gown,
- (12) T: [is-
- (13) M: [is displayed'=
[
- (14) T: =No- or- or- just displays'.
- (15) M: [no- displays',
displays' her peaches and cream complexion.
- (16) T: Right.

Beginning with Misa's partially articulated question, "Do I have-" (turn 1), and Mr. Peterson's latched-on response in which he cuts her off and tells her that she needs another subject (turn 2), we see their turns latching and overlapping at a number of junctures as they mutually set up and complete ideas (turns 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15). By the end of the exchange they are saying the same thing at the same time (turns 12 and 13; 14 and 15) as, together, they revise Misa's sentences. Because of the latching and overlapping, and especially their saying the same things at the same time, this is perhaps the most dramatic example in Misa's conferences of her jockeying with Mr. Peterson to compose text and thus a telling indication of the role of dialogic interplay in the formation and development of her composing skills. In her final draft, Misa's prose looks like this:

Baby blue eyes peek from behind her side swept hair. There she sits like a true English lady. Her soft pastel off-the-shoulders silk evening gown displays her peaches and cream complexion. On her wrist and neck are matching bracelet and choker made of genuine pearls and dazzling diamonds. Fourteen diamonds encircles the sapphire engagement ring which adorns her fourth finger. . . .

Once again conference talk has helped shape Misa's written text, the result of what is at times quite graphic "co-laboring."

CONCLUSION

In examining the discourse of the teacher-student writing conference in a classroom where such conferences are valued and frequently used, this study uncovers the collaborative nature of one secondary teacher's conference instruction as teacher and student mutually focus and structure their discourse in the service of the students' learning to write. It reveals, however, that for such learning to begin to blossom students need to participate in a diversity of conferences--in conferences taking place across tasks, for different durations, and for different purposes. For while the quantitative analysis showed the teacher to be the major participant in most dyads in focusing and structuring conference talk, it also revealed that patterns of dominance shift, often in predictably beneficial ways, as conferences vary. The case study illustrates how in the mutual process of negotiation and appropriation in their conference discourse both teacher and student shape ideas and promote the student's development as a writer, and how the teacher's initiations can be springboards for the student's active participation in conference talk. This very process signals individualized teaching and learning. Finally, while it examines one case, the study nonetheless suggests the rich potential of the secondary school classroom to support dialogic learning as a means of individualizing the process of learning to write.

NOTES

1. Transcription conventions:

Each transcribed line of talk represents an intonation unit (see Chafe, 1987).

Falling intonation	. at end of line
Rising intonation	, at end of line
Question intonation	? at end of line
Emphatic stress	' on stressed syllable
Overlapping speech	[
Latched speech	=
Long perceptable pause	. . .
Short perceptable pause	. .
Backchannels	/between slashes/
Short or jerky syllable	-
Elongated syllable	--
Tape was unclear	(uc)
Editorial Ellipses	[. . .]

REFERENCES

- Applebee, A. (1981). A study of writing in the secondary school. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Applebee, A., & Langer, J. (1983). Instructional scaffolding: Reading and writing as natural language activities. Language Arts, 60, 168-175.
- Blenski, M. (1976). The conference evaluation: A renewal. In P. Geuder et al. (Eds.), They really taught us how to write. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bruffee, K. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. College English, 48, 773-790.
- Bruner, J.S. (1975). From communication to language: A psychological perspective. Cognition, 3, 255-287.
- Bruner, J. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R.J. Jarvella, & W. Levelt (Eds.), The child's concept of language. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Butler, J. (1980). Remedial writers: The teacher's job as corrector of papers. College Composition and Communication, 31, 270-277.
- Campbell, D. (1986). Developing mathematical literacy in a bilingual classroom. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), The social construction of literacy. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cazden, C.B. (1982). Contexts for literacy: In the mind and in the classroom. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14, 413-427.
- Clark, H. & Clark, E. (1977). Psychology and language. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Cazden, C.B. (1983a). Peekaboo as an instructional model: Discourse development at school and at home. In B. Bain (Ed.), The sociogenesis of language and human conduct: A multi-disciplinary book of readings. New York: Plenum.
- Cooper, C. (1976). Teaching writing by conferencing. Survival Through Language: The Basics and Beyond. Proceedings of the 29th Language Communications Conference.
- Corsaro, W. (1985). Friendship and peer culture in the early school years. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Dysan, A. H. (1987). Individual differences in beginning composing: An orchestral vision of learning to write. Written Communication, 3, 411-442.

- Florio-Ruane, S. (1986). Teaching as response: The problem of writing conferences. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Freedman, S.W. (1979). College students reveal their learning processes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of The Modern Language Association, San Francisco.
- Freedman, S.W. (1980). Teaching and learning in the writing conference. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Washington, D.C.
- Freedman, S.W., with Greenleaf, C., & Sperling, M. (1987). Response to student writing. National Council of Teachers of English Research Monograph #23. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Freedman, S.W. & Katz (1987). Pedagogical interaction during the composing process: The writing conference. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), Writing in real time: Modelling production processes. New York: Longman.
- Freedman, S.W., & Sperling, M. (1985). Teacher-student interaction in the writing conference: Response and teaching. In S.W. Freedman (Ed.), The acquisition of written language: Revision and response. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Graves, D. (1983). Writing: Teachers and children at work. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Green, J., & Wallat, C. (1981). Mapping instructional conversations: A sociolinguistic ethnography. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gumperz, J. (1981). Conversational inference and classroom learning. In J. Green & C. Wallatt (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hahn, J. (1981). Students' reactions to teachers' written comments. National Writing Project Network Newsletter, 4, 7-10.
- Jacobs, S. & Karliner, A. (1977). Helping writers to think: The effect of speech roles in individual conferences on the quality of thought in student writing. College English, 38, 489-505.

- Knapp, J. (1976). Contract/conference evaluations of freshman composition. College English, 37, 647-653.
- Langer, J. (1984). Literacy instruction in American schools: Problems and perspectives. American Journal of Education, 93, 107-131.
- Leont'ev, A.N. (1981). Problems in the development of the mind. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- McDermott, R.P. (1976). Kids make sense: An ethnographic account of the interactional management of success and failure in one first-grade classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University.
- Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Michaels, S., Ulichny, P., & Watson-Gegeo, K. (1986). Writing conferences: Innovation or familiar routine? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Murray, D. (1979). The listening eye: Reflections on the writing conference. College English, 41, 13-18.
- Newman, D., Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (in prep.). The construction zone: Working for cognitive change in school.
- Rogoff, B., & Wertsch, J.V. (Eds.) (1984). Children's learning in the "zone of proximal development". San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rose, A. (1982). Spoken versus written criticism of student writing: Some advantages of the conference method. College Composition and Communication, 33, 326-330.
- Searle, D. & Dillon, D. (1980). The message of marking: Teacher written responses to student writing at intermediate grade levels. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 233-242.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. College Composition and Communication, 33, 148-156.
- Sperling, M. & Freedman, S.W. (1987). A good girl writes like a good girl: Written response and clues to the teaching/learning process. Written Communication, 3, 343-363.
- Tannen, D. (1984). Conversational style. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Walters, K. (1984). Ethnographic perspectives on the writing conference. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. New York.
- Wells, G. (1981). Language as interaction. In G. Wells (Ed.), Learning through interaction: The study of language development (Vol. 1). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1984). The zone of proximal development: Some conceptual issues. In B. Rogoff & J.V. Wertsch (Eds.), Children's learning in the "zone of proximal development". San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J.S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 17, 89-100.

TABLE 1
Relative Proportions of Teacher-Initiated and
Student-Initiated Topics

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
T- In.	N=5* 55.6%	N=15 75%	N=2 40%	N=13 31%	N=23 79.3%	N=8 66.7%
S- In.	N=4 44.4%	N=5 25%	N=3 60%	N=29 69%	N=6 20.7%	N=4 33.3%
Teacher-Initiated Topics According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=1 33.3%	N=1 50%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=1 100%
Tsk 2	N=2 66.7%	N=9 90%	N=0 0	N=10 32.3%	N=21 91.3%	N=4 100%
Tsk 3	N=2 66.7%	N=5 62.5%	N=2 66.7%	N=3 33.3%	N=2 50%	N=3 42.9%
Student-Initiated Topics According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=2 66.7%	N=1 50%	N=1 100%	N=2 100%	N=2 100%	N=0 0
Tsk 2	N=1 33.3%	N=1 10%	N=1 100%	N=21 67.2%	N=2 8.7%	N=0 0
Tsk 3	N=1 33.3%	N=3 37.5%	N=1 33.3%	N=6 66.7%	N=2 50%	N=4 57.2%
Teacher-Initiated Topics According To Duration**						
Quck	N=3 50%	N=6 60%	N=2 40%	N=0 0	N=2 28.6%	N=6 66.7%
Profl	N=2 66.7%	N=3 100%	---	N=5 23.8%	N=2 100%	---
Leis	---	N=6 85.7%	---	N=8 50%	N=19 95%	N=2 66.7%
Student-Initiated Topics According to Duration						
Quck	N=3 50%	N=4 40%	N=3 60%	N=5 100%	N=5 71.4%	N=3 33.3%
Profl	N=1 33.3%	N=0 0	---	N=16 76.2%	N=0 0	---
		14.3%		50%	5%	33.3%

Table 1 Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Teacher-Initiated Topics According to Purpose***						
Plan	N=2 66.7%	N=3 75%	N=1 50%	N=0 0	N=2 100%	N=1 50%
Writ Com.	N=2 50%	N=10 83.3%	N=1 33.3%	N=13 35.1%	N=19 76%	N=5 83.3%
Feed back	N=1 50%	N=0 0	---	N=0 0	N=2 100%	N=0 0
Ext.	---	N=2 66.7%	---	---	---	N=2 100%
Student-Initiated Topics According to Purpose						
Plan	N=1 33.3%	N=1 25%	N=1 50%	N=3 100%	N=0 0	N=1 50%
Writ Com.	N=2 50%	N=2 16.7%	N=2 66.7%	N=24 64.9%	N=6 24%	N=1 16.7%
Feed back	N=1 50%	N=1 100%	---	N=2 100%	N=0 0	N=2 100%
Ext.	---	N=1 33.3%	---	---	---	N=0 0

*N = number of topics initiated

**Duration = Quick, Prolonged, Leisurely

***Purpose = to plan future text, to clarify teacher's written comments, to give feedback to text on which there are no written comments, to cover concerns external to the immediate text

TABLE 2
Relative Proportions of Teacher-Owned,
Student-Owned, and Both-Owned Topics

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
T-Own	N=6* 66.7%	N=16 80%	N=2 40%	N=26 61.9%	N=26 89.7%	N=7 58.3%
S-Own	N=2 22.2%	N=3 15%	N=3 60%	N=16 38.1%	N=3 10.3	N=3 25%
Both Own	N=1 11.1%	N=1 5%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=2 16.7%
Teacher-Owned Topics According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=1 33.3%	N=1 50%	N=1 100%	N=0 0	N=2 100%	N=1 100%
Tsk 2	N=3 100%	N=10 100%	N=0 0	N=20 64.5%	N=21 91.3%	N=4 100%
Tsk 3	N=2 66.7%	N=5 62.5%	N=1 33.3%	N=6 66.7%	N=3 75%	N=2 28.6%
Student-Owned Topics According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=2 66.7%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=2 100%	N=0 0	N=0 0
Tsk 2	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=1 100%	N=11 35.5%	N=2 8.7%	N=0 0
Tsk 3	N=0 0	N=3 37.5%	N=2 66.7%	N=3 33.3%	N=1 25%	N=3 42.9%
Both-Owned Topics According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=0 0	N=1 50%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0
Tsk 2	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0
Tsk 3	N=1 33.3%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=2 28.6%

Table 2 Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Teacher-Owned Topics According To Duration**						
Quck	N=3 50%	N=6 60%	N=2 40%	N=0 0	N=5 71.4%	N=6 66.7%
Prol	N=3 100%	N=3 100%	---	N=18 85.7%	N=2 100%	---
Leis	---	N=7 100%	---	N=8 50%	N=19 95%	N=1 33.3%
Student-Owned Topics According to Duration						
Quck	N=2 33.3%	N=3 30%	N=3 60%	N=5 100%	N=2 28.6%	N=3 33.3%
Prol	N=0 0	N=0 0	---	N=3 14.3%	N=0 0	---
Leis	---	N=0 0	---	N=8 50%	N=1 5%	N=0 0
Both-Owned Topics According to Duration						
Quck	N=1 16.7%	N=1 10%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0
Prol	N=0 0	N=0 0	---	N=0 0	N=0 0	---
Leis	---	N=0 0	---	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=2 66.7%

Table 2 Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Teacher-Owned Topics According to Purpose***						
Plan	N=2 66.7%	N=3 75%	N=1 50%	N=0 0	N=2 100%	N=1 50%
Writ Com.	N=3 75%	N=11 91.7%	N=1 33.3%	N=26 70.3%	N=22 88%	N=4 5.7%
Feed back	N=1 50%	N=0 0	---	N=0 0	N=2 100%	N=0 0
Ext.	---	N=2 66.7%	---	---	---	N=2 100%
Student-Owned Topics According to Purpose						
Plan	N=1 33.3%	N=1 25%	N=1 50%	N=3 100%	N=0 0	N=1 50%
Writ Com.	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=2 66.7%	N=11 29.7%	N=3 12%	N=0 0
Feed back	N=1 50%	N=1 100%	---	N=2 100%	N=0 0	N=2 100%
Ext.	---	N=1 33.3%	---	---	---	N=0 0
Both-Owned Topics According to Purpose						
Plan	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0
Wr Com.	N=1 25%	N=1 8.3%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=2 33.3%
Feed back	N=0 0	N=0 0	---	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0
Ext	---	N=0 0	---	---	---	N=0 0

*N = number of topics owned

**Duration = quick, prolonged, and leisurely

***Purpose = to plan future text, to clarify teacher's written comments, to give feedback to text on which there are no written comments, to cover concerns external to the immediate text

TABLE 3
Relative Proportions of Request-Compliance, Question-Answer
Offer-Acceptance Turn Structures

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
RQ- CO	N=10* 15.6%	N=24 21.2%	N=6 16.7%	N=30 14%	N=16 13.5%	N=8 10.4%
Q- A	N=18 28.1%	N=52 46%	N=22 61.1%	N=128 59.8%	N=68 57.1%	N=33 42.9%
OF- AC	N=36 56.3%	N=37 32.7%	N=8 22.2%	N=56 26.2%	N=35 29.4%	N=36 46.8%
Request-Compliance Turn Structures According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=8 23.5%	N=4 50%	N=2 20%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=0 0
Tsk 2	N=1 7.1%	N=20 23.8%	N=2 13.3%	N=27 16.1%	N=16 15.5%	N=1 14.8%
Tsk 3	N=1 6.3%	N=0 0	N=2 18.2%	N=3 8.6%	N=0 0	N=7 13%
Question-Answer Turn Structure According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=10 29.4%	N=4 50%	N=7 70%	N=8 72.7%	N=4 100%	N=1 50%
Tsk 2	N=5 35.	N=35 41.7%	N=9 60%	N=101 60.1%	N=54 52.4%	N=10 47.6%
Tsk 3	N=3 18.8%	N=13 62%	N=6 54.6%	N=19 54.3%	N=10 83.3%	N=22 40.7%
Offer-Acceptance Turn Structure According to Task						
Tsk 1	N=16 47.1%	N=0 0	N=1 10%	N=3 27.3%	N=0 0	N=1 50%
Tsk 2	N=8 57.1%	N=29 34.5%	N=4 26.7%	N=40 23.8%	N=33 32%	N=10 47.6%
Tsk 3	N=12 75%	N=8 38.1%	N=3 27.3%	N=13 37.1%	N=2 16.7%	N=25 46.3%

Table 3 Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Request-Compliance Turn Structures According to Duration**						
Quck	N=9 18%	N=4 14%	N=6 16.7%	N=0 0	N=1 4.2%	N=2 4.7%
ProI	N=1 7.1%	N=6 19.4%	---	N=12 13.3%	N=1 5.6%	---
Leis	---	N=14 26.4%	---	N=18 17.3%	N=14 18.2%	N=6 17.7%
Question-Answer Turn Structure According to Duration						
Quck	N=13 26%	N=17 58.6%	N=22 61.1%	N=15 75%	N=18 75%	N=20 46.5%
ProI	N=5 35.7%	N=16 51.6%	---	N=55 61.1%	N=13 72.2%	---
Leis	---	N=19 35.9%	---	N=58 55.8%	N=37 48.1%	N=13 38.2%
Offer-Acceptance Turn Structure According to Duration						
Quck	N=28 56%	N=3 28%	N=8 22.2%	N=5 25%	N=5 20.8%	N=21 48.8%
ProI	N=8 57.1%	N=9 29%	---	N=23 25.6%	N=4 2.2%	---
Leis	---	N=20 37.7%	---	N=28 26.9%	N=26 33.8%	N=15 44.1%

Table 3, Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Request-Compliance Turn Structure According to Purpose***						
Plan	N=3 12%	N=0 0	N=2 10.5%	N=0 0	N=0 0	N=1 6.7%
Writ Com.	N=2 10.5%	N=24 26.1%	N=4 23.5%	N=30 15.5%	N=15 15.8%	N=6 14.3%
Feed back	N=5 25%	N=0 0	---	N=0 0	N=1 5.6%	N=0 0
Ext.	---	N=0 0	---	---	---	N=1 6.7%
Question-Answer Turn Structure According to Purpose						
Plan	N=4 16%	N=5 55.6%	N=12 63.2%	N=7 77.8%	N=4 66.7%	N=5 33.3%
Writ Com.	N=7 36.8%	N=39 42.4%	N=10 58.8%	N=113 58.3%	N=51 53.7%	N=16 38.1%
Feed back	N=7 35%	N=1 33.3%	---	N=8 72.7%	N=13 72.2%	N=4 80%
Ext.	---	N=7 77.8%	---	---	---	N=8 53.5%
Offer-Acceptance Turn Structure According to Purpose						
Plan	N=18 72%	N=4 44.4%	N=5 26.3%	N=2 22.2%	N=2 33.3%	N=9 60%
Wr Com.	N=10 52.6%	N=29 31.5%	N=3 17.7%	N=51 26.3%	N=29 30.5%	N=20 47.6%
Feed back	N=8 40%	N=2 66.7%	---	N=3 27.3%	N=4 22.2%	N=1 20%
Ext	---	N=2 22.2%	---	---	---	N=6 40%

*N = total number of RQ-CO, Q-A, OF-AC units, complete and incomplete

**Duration = Quick, Prolonged and Leisurely

***Purpose = to plan future text; to clarify teacher's written comments; to give feedback to text on which there are no comments; to cover concerns external to the immediate text

TABLE 4
Relative Proportions of Teacher-Initiated and Student-Initiated Turn Structure Units

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
T- In.	N=46* 71.9%	N=94 83.2%	N=28 77.8%	N=127 58.5%	N=98 82.4%	N=56 72.7%
S- In.	N=18 28.1%	N=19 16.8%	N=8 22.2%	N=87 40.7%	N=21 17.7%	N=21 27.3%
Teacher-Initiated Turn Structure Units According to Task						
Tsk	N=23	N=5	N=7	N=5	N=2	N=2
1	67.7%	62.5%	70%	45.5%	50%	100%
Tsk	N=12	N=77	N=12	N=100	N=88	N=14
2	85.7%	91.7%	80%	59.5%	85.4%	66.7%
Tsk	N=11	N=12	N=9	N=22	N=8	N=40
3	68.8%	57.1%	81.8%	62.9%	66.7%	74%
Student-Initiated Turn Structure Units According to Task						
Tsk	N=11	N=3	N=3	N=6	N=2	N=0
1	32.4%	37.5%	30%	54.6%	50%	0
Tsk	N=2	N=7	N=3	N=68	N=15	N=7
2	14.3%	8.3%	20%	40.5%	14.6%	33.3%
Tsk	N=5	N=9	N=2	N=13	N=4	N=14
3	31.3%	42.9%	18.2%	37.1%	33.3%	25.9%
Teacher-Initiated Turn Structure Units According To Duration**						
Quck	N=34	N=17	N=28	N=9	N=14	N=25
	68%	58.6%	77.8%	45%	58.3%	58.1%
Prol	N=12	N=30	---	N=55	N=17	---
	85.7%	96.8%		61.1%	94.4%	
Leis	---	N=47	---	N=63	N=67	N=31
		88.7%		60.6%	87%	91%
Student-Initiated Turn Structure Units According to Duration						
Quck	N=16	N=12	N=8	N=11	N=10	N=18
	32%	41.4%	22.2%	55%	41.7%	41.9%
Prol	N=2	N=1	---	N=35	N=1	---
	14.3%	3.2%		38.9%	5.6%	
Leis	---	N=6	---	N=41	N=10	N=3
		11.3%		39.4%	13%	8.8%

Table 4, Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Teacher-Initiated Turn Structure Units According to Purpose***						
Plan	N=17 68%	N=6 66.7%	N=15 79%	N=4 44.4%	N=5 83.3	N=8 53.3%
Writ Com.	N=15 79%	N=82 89.1%	N=13 76.5%	N=118 60.8%	N=76 80%	N=36 85.7%
Feed back	N=14 70%	N=0 0	---	N=5 45.5%	N=17 94.4%	N=1 20%
Ext.	---	N=6 66.7%	---	---	---	N=11 73.3%
Student-Initiated Turn Structure Units According to Purpose						
Plan	N=8 32%	N=3 33.3%	N=4 21.1%	N=5 55.6%	N=1 16.7%	N=7 46.7%
Writ Com.	N=4 21.1%	N=10 10.9%	N=4 23.5%	N=76 39.2%	N=19 20%	N=6 14.3%
Feed back	N=6 30%	N=3 100%	---	N=6 54.6%	N=1 5.6%	N=4 80%
Ext.	---	N=3 33.3%	---	---	---	N=4 26.7%

*N = number of turn structure units initiated

**Duration = Quick, Prolonged, and Leisurely

***Purpose = to plan future text; to clarify teacher's written comments; to give feedback to text on which there are no written comments; to cover concerns external to the immediate text

TABLE 5
 Relative Proportion of Teacher-Initiated Turn Structure Units
 That Get Completed by the Student, and Student-Initiated Turn
 Structure Units That Get Completed by the Teacher

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Teacher-Initiated/Student Completed						
	N=32*	N=63	N=23	N=94	N=54	N=40
	69.6%	67%	82.1%	74%	55.1%	71.4%
Student-Initiated/Teacher Completed						
	N=17	N=15	N=6	N=80	N=18	N=18
	94.4%	79%	75%	92%	85.7%	85.7%
Teacher-Initiated/Student Completed Turn Structure Units According to Task						
Tsk	N=16	N=2	N=4	N=5	N=1	N=2
1	69.6%	40%	57.1%	100%	50%	100%
Tsk	N=7	N=52	N=10	N=75	N=47	N=12
2	58.3%	67.5%	83.3%	75%	53.4%	85.7%
Tsk	N=9	N=9	N=9	N=14	N=6	N=26
3	81.8%	75%	100%	63.6%	75%	65%
Student-Initiated/Teacher-Completed Turn Structure Units According to Task						
Tsk	N=10	N=1	N=1	N=5	N=2	N=0
1	90.9%	33.3%	33.3%	83.3%	100%	0
Tsk	N=2	N=6	N=3	N=62	N=12	N=5
2	100%	85.7%	100%	91.2%	80%	71.4%
Tsk	N=4	N=8	N=2	N=13	N=4	N=13
3	80%	88.9%	100%	100%	100%	92.9%

Table 5, Continued

	Gina	Barb	Lisa	Misa	Donald	Rhonda
Teacher-Initiated/Student-Completed Turn Structure Units According To Duration**						
Quck	N=25 73.5%	N=11 64.7%	N=23 82.1%	N=7 77.8%	N=11 78.6%	N=23 92%
ProI	N=7 58.3%	N=22 73.3%	---	N=35 72.7%	N=14 82.4%	---
Leis	---	N=30 63.8%	---	N=47 74.6%	N=29 43.3%	N=17 54.8%
Student-Initiated-Teacher-Completed Turn Structure Units According to Duration						
Quck	N=14 87.5%	N=9 75%	N=6 75%	N=9 81.8%	N=10 100%	N=15 83.3%
ProI	N=2 100%	N=1 100	---	N=34 97.1%	N=0 0	---
Leis	---	N=5 83.3%	---	N=37 90.2%	N=8 80%	N=3 100%
Teacher-Initiated/Student-Completed Turn Structure Units According to Purpose***						
Plan	N=12 70.6%	N=5 83.3%	N=13 86.7%	N=2 50%	N=3 60%	N=8 100%
Writ Com.	N=10 66.7%	N=54 65.9%	N=10 76.9%	N=87 73.7%	N=37 48.7%	N=22 61.1%
Feed back	N=10 71.4%	N=0 0	---	N=5 100%	N=14 82.4%	N=1 100%
Ext.	---	N=4 66.7%	---	---	---	N=9 81.8%
Student-Initiated/Teacher-Completed Turn Structure Units According to Purpose						
Plan	N=7 87.5%	N=2 66.7%	N=4 100%	N=4 80%	N=1 100%	N=6 85.7%
Writ Com.	N=4 100%	N=7 70%	N=2 50%	N=71 93.4%	N=17 89.5%	N=6 100%
Feed back	N=5 83.3%	N=2 66.7%	---	N=5 83.3%	N=0 0	N=4 100%
Ext.	---	N=3 100%	---	---	---	N=2 50%

*N = number of turn structure units completed
**Duration = Quick, Prolonged, and Leisurely
***Purpose = to plan future text; to clarify teacher's written
comments; to give feedback to text on which there are no
written comments; to cover concerns external to the
immediate text

Figure 1
Friend Study: Anecdote

ok
Try this again
but with
more
information
about the
specific
report she
is writing
I will make
-Ludovic
Livillier's

my friend is a well organized individual.

In a month before our regional geographic-term papers for World Geography 2 were due, she has already

discovered a topic which sparks off her interest, ^{What is} Ontario, Canada

While her classmates including me, are still pushing

our reports till the last possible minute to the

due date, she ^{proceeds} goes on and starts preliminary

outlines concerning her project.

^{She} She - I remember charging to the library's

catalogs, ^{searching} searching for some materials on her

topic when Mr. Winkler, our geography teacher,

gave us the day as study period. After she finds these

the books she ^{needs} needs, my friend then ^{borrowed} borrowed an

almanac from the librarian desk and hurriedly ^{Do you} need all
with lightning speed copies down the information. ^{Yes}

A few days later, I ask ⁵¹ her how she is

10/10/55

idea, illustrations consists of a
percentage of — tower — that

What → Describe them.

doing on the term papers and
me her detailed and artistic illustrations. Little


by little her work is near completion. Finally,
is neatly typed and organized term papers
are finished with more than a week before due date.

is the only friend I know who organizes
her time so well that she never worries about dead
lines because she always has time to spare.

singley ~~with~~ ~~scientific~~ ~~neatly~~ ~~typed~~ ~~as~~ & ~~double-size~~
typed

along with ~~neatly~~ ~~typed~~ ~~and~~ ~~organized~~ ~~paper~~ ~~is~~
with ~~neatly~~ ~~typed~~ ~~and~~ ~~organized~~ ~~paper~~ ~~is~~
to individual illustrations are all finished
pictures

How many papers
to she doing.



Carleton M...
P...
...

Excellent!
Make these
changes before
I read your grade

A/R

Dr. Jeckle and Mr. Hyde

Jeckle (10/11)

"Hey ! Hey wait up!" I yell at the top of my ^{increase} lungs but she still didn't hear me. So I hasten my walking ~~pace~~ to a semi-jogging ~~pace~~, hoping I'd catch up to her without creating any permanent damage to my out of shape body. I can recognize her anywhere by the way she hunches her shoulders forward a little bit while she is walking. Furthermore, her dark blue Todd I sweat jacket and Levis are inseparable. Huffing and puffing, I finally manage to catch up to her.

"Hi , do you know I have been chasing after you for a couple of blocks already?" I inform her.

"Oh really?" she replies with the lift of her brows. "I always thought you like following strangers for the fun of it," she says with a devilish smirk on her lips, her laughing eyes peering at me behind the gold-rimmed spectacles. I ignore her remark and ask, "Did you start on your report yet?" Before she replies I already know the answer, "Yeah, I finished some illustrations and borrowed some books from the library already." We arrive at school and part ways to our lockers.

At school, is the model student who never crams for tests or completes projects at the last moment. She organizes her time very well. A month before our regional geographic term papers for World Geography II were due, has already discover a topic which sparks off her interest: Ontario, Canada. While her classmates including, me, are still pushing our reports

till the last possible minute to the due date, she proceeds on her preliminary outlines.

Then Mr. Tinkler, our geography teacher, ^{gives} gives us the day as study period, charges to the library's catalogues, hunting for some materials on her topic. After she finds the books she needs, my friend then borrows an advance from the librarian desk and copies down the information. ^{in advance} what information?

A few days later, I ask her how she is doing on the term paper and she shows me her detailed and artistic illustrations. My favorite illustrations are the pencil drawings she copied from the majestic "Canadian National Tower" and the modern, space-age looking "City Hall of Toronto." Her sketches show every geometric angle and curve impeccably to the last iota. In addition, she cleverly uses snow white paper to contrast the illustrations which ~~are~~ appear even more sharp and eye-catching.

Little by little her work is near completion. Finally, she has neatly double-spaced, typed and organized papers along with colorful maps, and vivid, picturesque illustrations all finished more than a week before due date.

most kids are I'm the complete opposite of her when it comes to doing school work on time. ^{they} I usually, if not most of the time cram at the last second. The day she finishes her term paper is the day I officially begin collecting information for my report.

If you only believe in her serious and studious attitude she adapts in class then you are fooled. Hidden within her is a sense of humor, and mischievous behavior which she reveals only to family members and friends. The victims most exposed to

~~type~~

Why not include your kids



her moods and pranks are her grandmother, brother, and sometimes Lily and me. Two weeks ago, ^{WILLIAMS} told me about some incidents which happened to her unfortunate grandma during one of her hyper-active disposition-over-the-weekend. In order to eliminate her pent-up energy, she snaps up her mom's suggestion and vacuums the whole house. Even then can turn her vacuum cleaner into a lethal weapon against anyone who crosses her path. She maneuvers the vacuum cleaner into a steamroller that is ready to flatten anyone to the likeness of a pancake. Her first prey is grandma whom shows no mercy during her state-of-temperament and pursues persistently behind the victim. 's poor grandma must dodge and avoid various furniture pieces which has momentarily became an obstacle course for her to evade the granddaughter who suddenly loses her sanity and becomes a replica of "Dennis the Menace". At last, grandma is quick enough to escape the threat of being level down to the thickness of a piece of paper.

After nearly wearing down the wall to wall carpeting at her own home, she still hasn't calmed down enough yet. Acting on an inspiration, she races into the well-equipped kitchen and seeks for a banana, to utilize as her make-believe automatic gun. Disappointingly, she fails to find a banana, even after she turns the upside down which now resembles a disaster area caused by dozen whirling twisters. Then sits dejectedly brooding over her bad luck until she spots the "Francisco Extra Sour Dough French Bread" lying on the counter among the "Ho Ho's", "Patrick" white bread, and other pastries. So instead of using a

try other words

who?

try other words.

make this an adjective

in red ink

try with out the 1/9/4

★



get the kitchen closer to the clause that uses it.

banana, she makes use of the french bread as her reply and sneak attack her grandma to make up for her grandmother's earlier fortunes. Good old grandma is not totally helpless because she too grabs a French bread as her sword and fights back vigorously. For a while is was winning but her grandma makes a strong come back, and forcing to retreat a few steps. The two of them now engage in a heart-stopping climax where every step or move is vital to winning this duel. Finally, the robust old lady won by using her fancy footwork.

truce ship

~~point of view of~~ is that she possesses the split personalities of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. In the confines of a classroom and in (prep) the presence of a teacher, she is the silent and invisible pupil who does her work perfectly. While on the other hand, she is like a brilliant candle that draws moths to her and many times the life of the party when she is with friends.

is also like John Wemmick in "Great Expectations" by Charles Dickens where she separates her grave mask and party mask during different situations she is in. I don't categorize her split personalities trait as a fault but on the contrary an asset that makes her an interesting friend. In addition, like her name as define, she is cheerful and causes joy to her family and friends.


good

if this goes, what else can go.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (ax^2 + bx + c) &= \frac{1}{a} \\
 x^2 + \frac{bx}{a} &= \frac{-c}{a} \\
 x^2 + \frac{bx}{a} + \frac{b^2}{4a^2} &= \frac{-c}{a} + \frac{b^2}{4a^2} \\
 \left(x + \frac{b}{2a}\right)^2 &= \frac{-4ac + b^2}{4a^2} \\
 x + \frac{b}{2a} &= \frac{\sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} \\
 x &= \frac{\sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$x = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}$$





... ..

Title

A

Make
anxious -
other wise
quite
good.

Baby blue eyes peeking from behind her side

add the
word that
will make this a subject

sweet hair sits, a true English lady her
peaches and cream complexion is disparagingly

Try
using dress as the
subject

Her soft pastel off-the-shoulders slip
evening gown on her wrist and neck are

matching bracelet and choker made of genuine
pearls and dazzling diamonds. Also, a sapphire

engagement ring As encircled by fourteen
diamonds which, adorns her fourth finger.

Try diamonds
as the subject

You still haven't guess yet, she is the
princess of Wales, Lady Diana.

Princess

Lady Diana's warmth radiates out
naturally from within. She easily won
the hearts of the world, especially the
affections of small children. Simon

Edwin, a little boy informs the princess



that he is instructed by ^{his} father to
kiss her. ^{She} ~~Diana~~ promptly kneels down, offers
her cheek and replies, "Then you better give
me one." Among the cheering crowd, she
encounters Joanne Edwards, an unfortunate
crippled child. The Princess of Wales reaches
down to pick up Joanne from the wheel chair
and ^{softly} ~~softly~~ hugs and kisses her. There is
^{various} ~~another~~ time ~~when~~ ~~Princess~~ Diana ~~is~~ ~~visiting~~
^a ~~the~~ hospital. She meets Adam Walford who
apologizes to ^{the} ~~Princess~~ ~~Diana~~ for having no
flowers to present to her. The princess says
she doesn't mind and offers her bouquet of
White Heather, roses, and carnations to him
to smell. The little boy exclaims, "Yuck! They
smell horrible." She shakes her head a little

study
this

bit with a smile on her face and remarks,

"typical male". Her love for children is highly

admirable but that's not her only quirkiness.

~~sp. ...~~ *quality*

Princess Diana has the abilities to charm and put most people at ease. She is like the girl next door who has no snobbishness in her make-up at all. Once she asks a young man whether he's going to watch the wedding or not. Obviously, he answers without thinking because he ends up with his foot in his mouth. The young man replies, "Yes, will you?" As he realizes his mistake, he probably wishes he was dead somewhere instead of saying ^{such} a stupid remark. She bids-to-be reliefs his discomfort by giving him a wink and "giggles", "I'm in it." During her visit to Dean Close School, an eighteen year

old Nicholas Hardy presents a single golden daffodil to Lady Diana. The school-boy then asks to kiss the hand of his future queen, Princess of Wales extends her hand permitting his request. While peers of Nicholas Hardy chuckle, Diana giggles.

Subconsciously, we are still dreamers and believers of fairy tales. For this reason alone we cast Princess Diana as our modern "Cinderella." With no doubts, she is every inch the beauty and elegance we associate ^{with} a princess ~~wife~~. While on the other hand, we must think of her as a real person in a real world. She too loves, makes mistakes, laughs or even been in some embarrassing moments like the rest of the humans on earth.